

Remarks

Applicant thanks the examiner for deciding that a claim limited to a pentapeptide library would be allowable, although Applicant maintains the position that the written description for other sized libraries is satisfied. "A patent claim is not necessarily invalid for lack of written description just because it is broader than the specific examples disclosed". *Martek Biosciences v. Nutrinova and Lonza* (Fed. Cir. 2009). However, Applicant amended independent claim 5 to be limited to a pentapeptide library (which had been the limitation of claim 50, now cancelled). Dependent claim 52 is added (was old claim 46, cancelled previously). Claim 53 is added; it is a combination of claim 5 and old claim 46.

As discussed today, Applicant will pursue the libraries for other length peptides, in a Continuation application.

Applicant requests allowance of the pending claims. Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments to deposit account number 12-0913 with reference to our attorney docket number (45240-105719).

Respectfully submitted,



Alice O. Martin
Registration No. 35,601

Date: October 14, 2009
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
P. O. Box 2786
Chicago, IL 60690-2786